

REMARKS

Status Summary

Claims 1-13 and 16-50 are pending in the present application. No claims are amended, no claims are added, and no claims are canceled. Therefore, upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-13 and 16-50 will be pending.

Telephone Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants' representative greatly appreciate the telephone examiner interview granted them on January 8, 2010. In the telephone examiner interview, the claims and cited art were discussed. Agreement was reached in regards to the claims. In particular, Applicants' representative suggested amending the independent claims to indicate combining the n video streams with a user interface stream occurs at a single computer. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments would be sufficient to overcome the rejections. Pursuant to the interview, Applicants' representative has amended the claims accordingly. Support for the amendment is found, for example, on page 13, lines 18-30 of the present specification. Additionally, the Examiner is invited to contact by telephone the Applicants' representative in order to resolve any related matters before issuing another Official Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13 and 16-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,353,450 to DeLeeuw, (hereinafter, "DeLeeuw") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,278,107 to Price, (hereinafter, "Price"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 16, 31, 35 and 39 recite methods, computer-readable media, and a system for controlling a computer using at least one video image of a plurality of video images. For example, claim 1 recites a method including capturing n video streams, n being an integer of at least two, the n video streams each comprising a plurality of video frames and each comprising video of a different user. The method also includes determining a location of an object in at least one of the n video streams. The method further includes controlling a program executing on the computer based on the location of the object. The method also includes combining the n video streams with a user interface stream generated by a computer operating system, thereby forming a composite video stream, providing the composite video stream for display to each of the different users, and displaying the composite video stream.

Each of independent claims 1, 16, 31, 35, and 39 has been amended to or already recite that combining the n video streams with a desktop or user interface stream occurs at a single computer. Support for the amendments is found, for example, on page 13, lines 18-30 of the present specification. Thus, each of the claims recite combining, at a single computer, video of different computer users with a user interface or desktop stream and providing the combined image for display to each of the different computer users.

There is absolutely no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in DeLeeuw or Price of combining, at a single computer, video of different users with a desktop or user interface stream and providing that combined image for display to different computer users. DeLeeuw is directed to an application that executes on a single user's computer and that combines video of that user with the computer desktop. (See, for example, Figure 1 of DeLeeuw.) Price is directed to managing windows in a collaborative meeting where multiple users can view the same application window. (See Abstract of Price.) Neither DeLeeuw nor Price combines video of different users with a user interface or desktop and provides that composite or combined image for display to the different users. When the single user video display system of DeLeeuw is combined with the multi-user application collaboration system of Price, the result would be video of the single user combined with an application, displayed with the application, and provided to the collaborators. The collaborators would only be presented with the image of the single user. Moreover, multiple instances of DeLeeuw with the collaboration system of Price would result in multiple single user video displays in a collaborative system window, and is not the same as a composite video stream that combines video of the different users with a desktop or user interface stream of a computer. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-13 and 16-50 as unpatentable over DeLeeuw in view of Price should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above Amendments and Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited.

If any small matter should remain outstanding after the Patent Examiner has had an opportunity to review the above Remarks, the Patent Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney in order to resolve these matters and avoid the issuance of another Official Action.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the filing of this correspondence to Deposit Account No. **50-0426**.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKINS, WILSON, TAYLOR & HUNT, P.A.



Date: February 17, 2010

By:

Gregory A. Hunt
Registration No. 41,085
Customer No. 25297

421/79 PCT/US GAH/SWH/trb